

scheme as he had done before. The Rev. Mr. McDonald, of Barney's River, expressed himself, in our own Synod, with sufficient decision, on the same side. He advanced many sound and cogent arguments against the scheme; and, if I remember aright, uttered not one word in its favour. These gentlemen will, no doubt, be surprised at being set down as *nothings*, in order to diminish the credit side of my account. And, did not the Rev. Mr. Herdman, the oldest member present, complain of the want of openness and regularity displayed in the getting up of the overture? The document in question was drawn out and written by the hand of the Respondent. It was signed, and ostensibly brought forward, by a delegate from the Synod of New Brunswick—a mode of procedure, not only irregular, but unprecedented in the annals of a Presbyterian Church Court. Wherefore, Mr. Herdman, with his usual plainness, asked, "If the voice was the voice of Jacob, why should the hand be the hand of Esau?" So far from the older and more experienced ministers having supported this overture, it is evident that these are the very men who are against it; and their opposition (part of which appeared in last *Record*), is destined to bring it to nought. The scheme was quite a *juvenile* production, and had about it none of the marks of ripe judgment and prudent foresight; and, I am confident that, if a meeting of Synod were summoned to-morrow, and the votes of all the members taken on the scheme, it would be rejected by a great majority.

As to whether or not there was any occasion for my expressing a hope that the business of the Church would be conducted in a more *open*, as well as regular manner, I shall leave the reader to judge, asking him to notice two facts: (1.) One of the members stated at Synod, that he could assure the Court that the Colonial Committee would grant a supplement in aid of the Hall. This point had evidently been made sure of, and it is certain that the Colonial Committee would not have made a promise of this kind, had they not been induced to believe that the Church in Nova Scotia was unanimous on this subject. But, who authorized this individual to enter into negotiations with the Colonial Committee? No Synod, no Presbytery, nobody did so. (2.) The same party stated, after the discussion was over, and when the project seemed beyond danger, that it was intended to have the Hall in operation next summer.

I observe, my Respondent states that a unanimous *finding* of the Synod, in favour of the Hall, was recorded in the Minutes, and attaches much value to this. I shall explain, very briefly, how this happened. The leader of the opposition was the Rev. Mr. McMillan of Earltown. That gentleman was to bring forward a counter-motion, but was entreated not to do so, as the motion "did not commit the Synod to a Hall." He complied with this request, and hence the result. This is my

testimony; if it be wrong, I trust the Rev. Mr. McMillan will correct me.

I think I have shown that the overture in question was neither brought before, nor appeared in, nor passed through the Court, in "precisely the same way as every other scheme" that preceded it. Its history is a very different history from that of the Dalhousie College Scheme, and reads an instructive lesson to those who would presume to act the part of legislators in the Church, by framing ordinances to bind the people, in the secret cabinet of their own brains. Inexperienced and superficial statesmen have often committed this error; and, after travelling far without a guide, have been obliged to retrace their steps and lose their labour. Legislation, in State or Church, is a more difficult matter than many suppose. He who, in a free country, makes laws without first consulting the party whom they are intended to bind, perpetrates an injustice and a blunder. A garment, which is made without regard to the taste or the mould of the wearer, is not likely to suit, when it comes to be fitted on. But, in sooth, a Tailor never acts in this manner. He is a good artist for young politicians to imitate.

Finally, in regard to this part of the subject, suffer me to remark that even had it been the fact that the present scheme was introduced in precisely the same manner as every other scheme before it, the projectors ought to have perceived that the extraordinary importance of the measure proposed rendered it necessary for them to take extraordinary precautions to have it generally foreknown and thoroughly discussed. Never before were the people called on to undertake such a vast responsibility, yet the people received no warning of the bill which was to tax them. Never before were the deliberative wisdom and co-operative action of the Church's representatives so urgently required, yet the representatives of the Church, with only two or three exceptions, knew nothing of the proposal, until towards the close of the Synod, when they were all on the eve of returning to their homes.

My Respondent is vexed that I did not protest and appeal at the Synod. I have protested and appealed, but in a more effectual way. It is rather unfair to take a man by surprise, and, when he is down, say, "Why did you suffer me to do this thing?" My Respondent is surprised that I did not make a speech about my surprise, when the phenomenon referred to suddenly made its appearance. "When people are so much surprised, they generally express themselves to that effect there and then." I am not very sure about this doctrine. The writer hath here thrown out a metaphysical question not uninteresting to philosophers. We shall suppose (for the sake of illustration) that a traveller is walking along the Queen's highway, under the cloud of night, feeding his heart with delectable thoughts, and warbling unto himself